



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 09/186,856      | 11/05/98    | GORDON M             | GCR-001             |

DAVID P GORDON  
65 WOODS END ROAD  
STAMFORD CT 06905

QM21/0216

| EXAMINER  |
|-----------|
| NGUYEN, B |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 3713     | 4            |

DATE MAILED: 02/16/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/186,856

Applicant(s)

Gordon et al.

Examiner

J. Harrison

Group Art Unit  
3713



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) J. Harrison

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) GALLAGHER, THOMAS A.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Feb 15, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: independent claims 1, 7, 10, and 18 / in general

Identification of prior art discussed:

Logg and Naka et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussion of claimed split-screen feature and the cooperative feature. Applicant to argue the rejections directed to the split screen feature, as it was agreed that Naka did not anticipate this feature as claimed. Applicant to consider further definition of the cooperative feature of the claims, as explanation was provided of how Naka as well as Logg were interpreted to meet the claim language as it presently stands.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

J. HARRISON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3713